

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005.

Currently, claims 1-58 are pending.

I. Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-54 as being anticipated by *Rosenberg et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,373). Because *Rosenberg et al.* does not disclose all of the limitations of Applicant's claims, Applicant respectfully asserts that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant's specification explains that:

The present invention provides an input system which immobilizes the head of the user with respect to his torso and detects attempts by the user to move his head using strain gauges or other pressure sensors. The signals from these strain gauges are sent to a processing unit which determines the magnitude and direction of the forces which the user is applying, and then uses these forces to determine how to modify a simulated environment. The simulated environment is presented to the user using display and other feedback systems ... In another embodiment of the input system, devices are provided to immobilize the arms, fingers or legs of the user ... [Specification, page 2].

The technology described in the above-quoted paragraph is not taught by the cited prior art. For example, claim 1 recites "an immobilizing device which restricts the motion of a portion of a user's body." This limitation is not disclosed by *Rosenberg et al.*

Rosenberg et al. "is directed to controlling and providing force feedback to a user operating a human/computer interface device." [*Rosenberg et al.*, col. 3, lines 24-26]. There is no disclosure of an immobilizing device. The motion and feedback discussed in *Rosenberg et al.* is in response to indication of change in position from user object 34. *Rosenberg et al.* describes user object 34 as follows:

User object 34 is preferably a device or article that may be grasped or otherwise contacted or controlled by a user and which is coupled to interface device 14. By "grasp", it is meant that users may releasably engage a grip portion of the object in some fashion, such as by hand, with their fingertips, or even orally in the case of handicapped persons. The user 22 can manipulate and move the object along provided degrees of freedom to interface with the host application program the user is viewing on display screen 20. Object 34 can be a joystick, mouse, trackball, stylus, steering wheel, medical instrument (laparoscope, catheter, etc.), pool cue, hand grip, knob, button, or other article.

As can be seen from the above quotation, user object 34 is intended to be moved ("... user 22 can manipulate and move the object..."). In fact, *Rosenberg et al.* discloses movement throughout its disclosure:

- * "the position of the user object joystick determines ..." [*Rosenberg et al.* col. 16, lines 29-30];
- * "When a user moves ... with a joystick" [*Rosenberg et al.* col. 19, lines 46-47];
- * "user's manipulations of object 34 ..." [*Rosenberg et al.* col. 23, lines 26-27];
- * "user can move the joystick ..." [*Rosenberg et al.* col. 28, lines 26-27];
- * "the greater the joystick handle is moved ..." [*Rosenberg et al.* col. 30, lines 52-53];

Thus, *Rosenberg et al.* is explicitly disclosing movement rather than immobilization. Because *Rosenberg et al.* does not disclose an immobilizing device, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Rosenberg et al.*

Claim 1 further recites "sensors which detect forces applied by the restricted portion of the user's body." Since *Rosenberg et al.* does not disclose "an immobilizing device which restricts the motion of a portion of a user's body" *Rosenberg et al.* does not disclose "sensors which detect forces applied by the restricted portion of the user's body." That is, since *Rosenberg et al.* does not disclose immobilizing a portion of a body, it cannot disclose sensing force from the immobilized portion of the body.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that *Rosenberg et al.* does disclose an immobilizing device. The Examiner cites to the mentioning of a race car at column 23, lines 25-44

and argues that a person would be immobilized in a race car. There are multiple reasons why the Examiner's argument fail to prove anticipation of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

First, there is no evidence of record that at the time of the filing of Applicant's invention that a race car includes an immobilizing device. For example, a race car driver may not be immobilized so that the driver can shift the transmission, turn the steering wheel, push the gas and brake pedals, turn his/her head to see and leave the car.

Second, *Rosenberg et al.* does not actually disclose that the race car immobilizes. Although the Examiner cites to column 23, lines 25-44, that passage of *Rosenberg et al.* states that the race car is a virtual race car that is in a video game or simulation. There is no disclosure that the user is in a race car or that there is an immobilizing device. For example, the passage of *Rosenberg et al.* at column 23, lines 25-44 states that "The user's manipulations of object 34 may have caused a new type of force to required. For example, if the user is moving a virtual race car within a virtual pool of mud in a video game, a damping type of force should be applied to the object 34 as long as the race car moves within the mud. ... When the race car moves out of the pool of mud, a new type of force (i.e. a removal of damping force in this case) is required. ..." There is no disclosure in this passage or any other passage in *Rosenberg et al.* that mentions an immobilizing device in a race car.

Third, to the extent that the Examiner argues that some part of a driver of a race car is immobilized, claim 1 recites "sensors which detect forces applied by the restricted portion of the user's body." *Rosenberg et al.* does not disclose the detection of forces applies by the portion of the user's body restricted by the immobilizing device, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites to col. 28, lines 35-55; however, this text discusses transducers which apply feedback to the user, rather than sensing forces from an immobilized portion of the user.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant asserts that claim 1, and all claims that depend from claim 1, are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 2-54 are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons as claim 1.

II. New Claims

Applicant has added new claim 55-58, which are patentable over the cited prior art for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

III. Examiner Interview

On January 17, 2006, Applicant's undersigned attorney requested an interview with the Examiner. The Examiner left a voicemail message for Applicant's attorney refusing to grant the interview.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-58 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, February 23, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

February 23, 2006

By:

Burt Magen

Burt Magen
Reg. No. 37,175

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105-2871
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665